

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 25, 2004 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the Abstract of the Disclosure, drawings, specification and the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9 and 11 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 4, 6, 10 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice. The abstract, drawings, and specification have also been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9 and 11 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action objected to the drawings because elements in Figure 1 allegedly needed labels. The drawings were also objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5) because reference 21 in Figure 1 is not mentioned in the specification. The drawing has been amended to remove any reference to element 21. No new matter has been added. Thus, the objection to the drawings is rendered moot.

The Office Action objected to the abstract of the disclosure because it included legal phraseology. The abstract has been amended to remove any such language. No new matter has been added. Therefore, the objection to the abstract is rendered moot.

The Office Action rejected claims 2-5, 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. More specifically, the Office Action indicated that

certain limitations in these claims lacked proper antecedent basis. The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. Thus, this rejection is rendered moot.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 5-7, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,771,424 to Suzuki. The Official Action acknowledged that Suzuki fails to explicitly disclose that the network is an ATM network and that the call is an ATM call. However, the Office Action concluded that such a modification would have been obvious at the time the invention was made. This rejection is rendered moot for the following reasons.

The Office Action indicated that claims 2-4 and 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claims 1 to include the subject matter of claims 4 and 6, and have amended claim 7 to include the subject matter of claims 10 and 12. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 7 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 are dependent upon claim 1, while claims 8, 9, and 11 are dependent upon claim 7. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 11 should be found allowable for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 7, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed herein. Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that the

amendments to the abstract, specification, drawings, and claims now place this application in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, and 11 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Majid S. Albassam
Registration No. 54,749

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

MSA:scc

Enclosures: Replacement Sheet (Figure 1)
Abstract of the Disclosure



RECEIVED

NOV 22 2004

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

Technology Center 2600

A method and system for routing in an ATM network, which has a plurality of nodes connected to each other via links and a network management centre connected to the ATM network. The optimisation information is defined in a centralized manner in the network management centre and the nodes apply the results of this centralized optimisation according to their own condition. The optimisation information is defined so that sum of rejected capacity for each connection between an origin node and a terminal node does not exceed a predetermined limit. The invention provides the advantage that the operation of individual nodes in setting up connections is very fast. Moreover, a fair distribution of network resources among users is achieved.